

Date: Sat, 28 Aug 93 04:30:14 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #310  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 28 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    310

Today's Topics:

    I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah (2 msgs)  
        MARS/CAP incentives  
    Updating the test (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Sat, 28 Aug 1993 10:09:10 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>Many folks have mentioned problems on the HF bands, and in particular,  
>on 14.313 MHz, with extra class license holders receiving fines and/or  
>license revocations. They've used these items to attempt to prove that  
>knowledge of CW does not make one a better operator.  
>  
>But their arguments contain a major flaw: there are no problems in the  
>CW subbands; there is no intentional interference, no profanity, no  
>>false MAYDAY calls, no one being arrested or fined or having their  
>license yanked. Any and all problems are on the voice segments.  
>  
>The CW operators are true gentlemen. I dare any of you to listen to  
>the CW segments and prove me wrong (of course, that will take a knowledge  
>of code...)

>

So your point is? Requiring passing a 5, 13, or 20 WPM morse code test does not a gentlemen CW operator make. I've heard some pretty poor operating practice in the CW portions of the band when there's DX afoot. But if you're suggesting that those that take a real interest in CW are gentlemen, fine, I don't have a beef with that. I personally think VHF/UHF weak signal guys are the most gentlemanly, and only when the HFER's join in at contest time does the operating quality suffer. But we each have our own prejudices. Let's try to stop casting those prejudices in the form of requirements.

But as to suggesting morse code as a licensing requirement makes better operators, the mayhem on 14.313 and elsewhere is simple proof to the contrary. All those clowns passed that morse code requirement and weren't made into better operators. By the time the average ham gets his or her license, those personality traits which affect their operating character have long since been established. Licensing requirements can't fix that.

Please don't take this as a knock against morse code. It's unfortunate that the argument against higher speed morse code requirements always seems to get twisted around into an argument about morse code. It make little difference whether morse code is good, bad or indifferent. The question is: "Do the current morse code requirements and associated privileges granted make sense given the basis and purpose of the amateur radio service and the current technology?" I personally believe they don't make sense and should be revised.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

PS And no Paul, I don't have any references to cite for the above. It is purely my own opinion and you are welcome to completely discount it. After all, I'm not published in the area so I certainly can't know anything.

-----

Date: 28 Aug 93 00:25:18 GMT  
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!sgiblab!bridge2!zen.DEV.3Com.COM!  
joer@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box) writes:

>=====

>!I think the point really is that the 13-20 WPM as a REQUIREMENT for HF

>!work is a silly and does not seem to fit in the "real" world. I have had  
>!my ticket since Feb. and am proud to say NO, I will not learn the code past  
>!5 WPM. But I still want HF access, I should not be shut out. But thats not  
>!to say that I feel it should be eliminated, only as a requirement.  
>!

>=====

> But I want a car to drive around the streets, but I shouldn't have to  
> have insurance.

[rest deleted]

Since this is a Ham Radio thread, I won't post what I think about  
governments requiring drivers to carry insurance so that fixing a  
simple ding in a car costs nearly \$1000.

I will say that of all the things said about CW, there's one (IMHO)  
that's patently untrue: it (CW) is by no means a filter of any sort.  
CW prowess does not guarantee a better amateur. Just listen to parts  
of 40 or 80 some night. Yes, it should take some real work and  
commitment to earn an amateur license. But let's make that work and  
commitment germane to the 90s. Notice the lack of questions about  
vacuum tubes, variometers, and spark on the tests!

Just some random thoughts . . . 73 de Joe, KC6TXU

--

-----  
Joe L. Reda, KC6TXU \* jlr@netcom.com \* Campbell, CA \* all opinions are mine  
"Full separation of church & state . . not just a good idea, IT'S THE LAW!"  
////////////////////////////////////

-----

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 1993 18:03:21 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: MARS/CAP incentives  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug27.140938.4231@indirect.com> Darrell Shandrow,  
nu7i@indirect.com writes:

>privillage to handle the traffic. You'd realize, hey, if I pass these  
>test and get that license I can use that radio more often. It would be  
an  
>incentive for more people to get their tickets! 73

In fact I did study and take the test for the novice test. Just for the  
record I didn't ever use my novice ticket. The use of a telegraph key



> change the locks!  
> \*\*Rick Aldom ex STS1/SS\*\*The opinions expressed are my  
> \*\*Sub Sailors do it deeper\*\*own and probably aren't yours!  
^^

Again, I agree completely!  
Your extreme case of my argument (public safety hazards) \*could\* be argued (plane crash, hundred stranded, beacon smashed, ham with HT but mic busted, can only give location in CW using ptt key, but only station in range has a tech minus at the helm), (or, yedder bet, ham \*builds a CW rig from plane remnants :) but that was not my point. Riffraff reduction does not have to save lives, it need only make the airwaves a little cleaner.

And yes, people will still murder and transmit despite laws and regs to the contrary; do we toss out murder laws along with CW requirements? You suggest changing locks to avoid politicians. This is a non sequiter (sp?). You know that locks (and regs) only keep honest people honest.

But, if you are (as I assume) a diehard anticoder, how about responding to my question: what do we REPLACE the code requirements with? Or do we just give a license to anyone who can memorize a few questions from the back of a book? 73 OM de W5STILLWAITING keith smith

-----  
Date: Fri, 27 Aug 93 17:24:22 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Updating the test  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <25j7tg\$elk@hydra.unm.edu> keith@unm.edu writes:

>Me: Tech++ (passed 3B, failed the 13 WPM) still waiting for ticket, 11 wks,  
> 2 days.

Me: Extra, been licensed and active since 5/77.

>Arguments FOR code:  
> 1. Riffraff- A few hours spent listening to CB (if you can stand that long)  
> are sufficient justification for this. Airwaves are limited, desire to  
> use them is not. Alternatives to making an amature license difficult  
> to get are making it very expensive or limiting the total number issued.

CW is not proven to keep riff-raff out of the amateur service. Witness me, witness the 14.313 debacle, witness the 7.255 WesCARS jamming, witness all manner of rude and obnoxious operating for at least the last 16 years. I operate 2m on a daily basis in the Los Angeles area; in my own experience,

the quality of ham radio has not changed significantly since the 5WPM requirement was dropped from the Tech license.

> 2. Code is a good way of communicating- less power, less bandwidth, no accents. Besides, it's kinda fun! (and I needed a "2" :)

Sure. Clover is pretty neat, too.

If you mean "no accents" to say that people are always easy to understand, I beg to differ. A person's fist can be quite variable. Since, it seems, most folks use automatic keyers now, fists are pretty consistent, but, I've heard plenty of straight keys and semi-auto keyers (bugs) that were very accented and hard to copy.

>Arguments AGAINST code:

>(first stolen from (name forgotten, post deleted) Stohl (spelling unsure)

> 1. It's unfairly weighted. As my elmer pointed out to me (before my novtech test) if you KNOW subelements A-D, you have 15 of 19 already. Just GUESS any 4 from E-I (4 out of 10 of a multiple-choice test- not TOO hard:) and you have it! But copy one character less than required or miss 4 of 10 questions- you're sunk.

I'm not sure I accept this logic.

> 2. It's outdated. Given the choice, we TALK to each other. And it no longer represents a useful test of the practical, physical skills used by hams.

Yup. Keep in mind, just cause something is outdated isn't enough. We need to actively emphasize the new things...

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Mon, 16 Aug 93 15:06:55 GMT  
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jfhCBMC0B.L9L@netcom.com>, <1993Aug12.153325.23719@ke4zv.uucp>, <30722@ksr.com>

Subject : Re: Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention

In article <30722@ksr.com> jfw@ksr.com (John F. Woods) writes:  
>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:  
>>In article <jfhCBMC0B.L9L@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:  
>>>collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com wrote:  
>>>>You wanted bet your license that if the FCC sees you with a transmitter  
>>>>on your belt, asks to see your license and you refuse that they wouldn't  
>>>>suspend your license?  
>>>How would they know which license to suspend?  
>>The FCC has statutory authority to inspect any station for any reason  
>>at any reasonable hour.  
>  
>And to directly answer Jack's actual question, though not definitively,  
>they would probably find out when your lawyer let them know as part of  
>the plea bargaining arrangement. If you refuse to show your license, they  
>probably have "probable cause" to arrest you on the spot for unlicensed  
>operation (remember, "probable cause" doesn't even have to come close to  
>certainty).

Since ownership of an HT without a license is legal, then there is no  
justification of "probable cause."  
It is in violation of no FCC  
law to have such equipment at home or on one's belt (an HT).

> Childish games are rarely of much value when dealing with  
>law enforcement personnel.

But neither is rolling over and playing dead or having one's rights  
trampled by law enforcement personnel. I do not just "ID" myself to anyone  
because they want it.

In another post:  
>In article <jfhCBMC0B.L9L@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:  
>>collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com wrote:  
>>  
>>>You wanted bet your license that if the FCC sees you with a transmitter  
>>>on your belt, asks to see your license and you refuse that they wouldn't  
>>>suspend your license?  
>>  
>>How would they know which license to suspend?

To which >Gary Coffman KE4ZV added:  
>The FCC has statutory authority to inspect any station for any reason  
>at any reasonable hour. (They aren't supposed to come knocking on  
>your door at 3 am unless they have evidence you're operating. Evidence  
>of operation is prima facia evidence that it's a reasonable hour.) A  
>station inspection includes the equipment and all relevant documents,  
>including your license(s). Refusing to allow an inspection is itself a  
>violation of the rules and can subject you to fines and revocation

>of your license(s). When walking with a HT, you \*are\* the station, it  
>can be assumed it's a reasonable hour, and they can demand to inspect  
>your equipment and your license documents.

True to a point, but since ownership/possession of an HT is perfectly  
legal for anyone, licensed or not, then I'd think the FCC would  
have to have ALSO observed someone operating before having sufficient  
probable cause to just stop someone and ask them for their ham license.

>Since our station and  
>operator licenses are printed on the same piece of paper, it would  
>be difficult for them not to see if you had the proper operator  
>privileges for the station you are carrying.

As a novice, I had equipment that could operate in bands that I  
was not "privileged" to operate in. The issue is not the  
equipment, it is: Has actual unauthorized/illegal transmission  
occurred?

> Failure to have the  
>station license documents present at the station location is also  
>a violation.

Given that the FCC recently stopped issuing station license details  
(the space is left blank on all new licenses), I suspect that isn't  
the case anymore. Regardless, none of us that operate mobile/portable  
actually have a station license for such mobile/portable situations anyway.

>So the short answer is that they could suspend \*any\* and \*all\*  
>licenses you may hold if they find you without the proper documents,  
>or if you refuse inspection.

ONLY if you are actually transmitting.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP              bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays              email via Internet      whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: 27 Aug 1993 14:50 EDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!utah-morgan!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!  
spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!  
nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu



References <1993Aug24.031323.13221@kd4nc.uucp>, <25df23\$3mf@zephyr.ens.tek.com>,  
<1993Aug27.154409.25938@kd4nc.uucp>sfc.nas  
Subject : Re: Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention

In article <1993Aug27.154409.25938@kd4nc.uucp>, n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed)  
writes...

>nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow) writes:

>

>>I would like to see MARS restricted to only licensed amateur radio  
>>operators. What does everyone think? It seems that the CAP activity does  
>>not necessarily mean that the individual has the needed radio operating  
>>skills. Besides, it would help us gain more hams if they had to be  
>>licensed to be MARS ops. 73

>

>OK, are you in MARS? Which service? The CAP are only restricted to Air Force  
>MARS. CAP is also a participant in the SHARES program, too.... you don't see  
>to many Hams in SHARES, do you? Being a HAM does not mean that you are a  
>trained communicator. NO WHERE in the ham training do they tell you how  
>to run your radio...how to sign on , sign off, pass traffic, etc...they say  
>give your call every 10 mins and at the end and that is it.

>

>In CAP , Georgia Wing requires an 8 hour training course including a written  
>test, a ITU phonetic alphabet test, and on on air proficiency test. In AFMARS  
>there's an additional 8 hours of on air training which concludes with passing  
>2 formal messages, receiving 2 formal messages, and a written test....Navy  
>MARS is even harder, I hear.

>

>With CAP comm training, augmented by AFMARS training (which is required before  
>a CAP station can check in to a mars net, with a distinct cap/mars callsign),  
>I do not think you will find a problem with bad operators...in fact, you'll  
>have even better operators....16 hrs of training... and most CAP communicators  
>that are completely dedicated to communications are usually hams anyway.

>

>73 de John Reed - n4tii - afa2fh - redstar 207

>AEC Hall County, GA ARES

>Air Force MARS, TEXN agent

>Group 2 Communications Officer, GA Wing CAP

>

>n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>

I have to take exception with some of this message although I do support the  
general concept of operator training. Many non "MARS"/"CAP" hams are much  
better trained communicators than those who have passed MARS training. Some  
hams have extensive communications training, including net setup and message  
passing. Indeed the whole ARRL NTS does formal message passing. I as well  
as other hams have extensive experience from prior work (mine in the US Army as

Communications - Electronics staff officer).

Don't get me wrong I see nothing wrong with MARS and CAP as separate from the Ham spectrum and operation. I just don't like the implied condemnation of most hams as not being experienced communicators. I would venture to guess that many hams have more than 16 hours equivalent experience and training.

Erich

N30XM

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #310  
\*\*\*\*\*